



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,320	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04781US	8856

7590 05/13/2005

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

DAVIS, ZACHARY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,320

Applicant(s)

ROYER ET AL.

Examiner

Zachary A. Davis

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. An amendment was received on 29 November 2004. Claims 1, 2, 8, 12-16, and 20-22 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In Claims 1 and 13, in the limitation "incorporating, said encrypted address portion", the comma after "incorporating" should be deleted.

In Claim 1, in the limitation "providing a key supporting decryption of said encrypted address portion, to a destination system", the comma after "portion" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. It was noted in the previous Office action that the specification provided enabling written description for encryption using triple DES, but that the specification did not provide enabling written description of the claimed limitation of encryption using the RSA algorithm. The claim has been amended to recite encryption using the RSA MD5 algorithm. The specification does provide written description of the use of the MD5 algorithm; however, MD5 is a hashing algorithm and not an encryption algorithm. Therefore the claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as set forth below.

5. The rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in light of the amendment to the claim.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, Claim 12 recites the limitation "said link processor encrypts said address portion using an RSA (Rivest Shamir Adleman) MD5 compatible algorithm". However, it is unclear how one would encrypt using the MD5 algorithm, since MD5 is a hash function and not an encryption algorithm. This renders the claim indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levergood, US Patent 5708780.

In reference to Claim 1, Levergood discloses a system that includes a link processor for identifying and encrypting an address portion of a URL (column 5, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID includes an accessible domain that is included under the digital signature), incorporating the encrypted address portion with an unencrypted address portion into a URL (column 5, lines 52-54, where [SID] includes the encrypted address portion), and providing a key allowing decryption to a destination system (column 5, lines 61-65, where the key is shared by the authentication and content servers). Levergood further discloses a communication processor for incorporating the URL into formatted data for communication to the destination system (see column 4, lines 1-6 and column 7, lines 15-21).

In reference to Claims 2 and 3, Levergood further discloses adaptively identifying the address portion based on the application associated with the URL (see column 3, line 56-column 4, line 18, where a link is processed differently depending on whether it is within the same application or to a different application).

In reference to Claims 5 and 7, Levergood further discloses compressing the address portion with a hash function prior to encryption (column 5, lines 61-65).

In reference to Claims 8 and 9, Levergood further discloses incorporating a session identifier into the URL by formatting the session identifier (column 5, lines 52-54, noting column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a session identifier).

In reference to Claims 10 and 11, Levergood further discloses concatenating data associated with a personal record, specifically a user identifier, to the address portion to form a data element and encrypting the data element (column 3, lines 34-37, where the SID includes a user identifier and accessible domain included under the digital signature).

In reference to Claim 13, Levergood discloses a system that includes a link processor for identifying and encrypting an address portion of a URL (column 5, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID includes an accessible domain that is included under the digital signature) and incorporating the encrypted address portion with an unencrypted address portion and a session identifier into a URL (column 5, lines 52-54, where [SID] includes the encrypted address portion, and column 3, lines 12-16, noting SID is a session identifier). Levergood further discloses a communication processor for incorporating the URL into formatted data for communication to the destination system (see column 4, lines 1-6 and column 7, lines 15-21).

In reference to Claim 15, Levergood discloses a system that includes an input processor that receives an encoded URL, a link processor that processes the encoded URL by identifying encrypted and unencrypted address portions of the URL (column 5, lines 52-54, where [SID] includes the encrypted address portion) and decrypting the encrypted address portion, and a validation processor that determines if the address portion has been subject to unauthorized modification by determining if the decrypted portion is different from the unencrypted portion (see column 6, lines 5-16, where the digital signature is validated).

In reference to Claim 16, Levergood further discloses applying a hash function to the unencrypted portion and comparing first and second hash values in which a match indicates successful validation (column 6, lines 5-16).

In reference to Claim 17, Levergood further discloses identifying a session identifier in the received URL (column 5, lines 52-54, noting column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a session identifier).

In reference to Claims 18 and 19, Levergood further discloses that the URL includes data associated with a personal record, specifically a user identifier (column 3, lines 34-37, where the SID includes a user identifier and accessible domain included under the digital signature).

Claim 20 is directed to a method that corresponds substantially to the system of Claim 1, and is rejected by a similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 22 are directed to methods that correspond substantially to the systems of Claims 15 and 16, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 4, 6, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood.

In reference to Claim 4, Levergood discloses everything as applied above to Claim 3. However, Levergood does not explicitly disclose the use of Active Server Page (ASP) applications. Official notice is taken that it is well known to use scripting languages such as ASP, CGI, and Javascript to allow dynamic or changing content to be displayed as part of a web page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Levergood to include the use of ASP applications, in order to allow a wider variety of information to be presented through the use of dynamic web pages.

In reference to Claim 6, Levergood discloses everything as applied above to Claim 5. In reference to Claim 14, Levergood discloses everything as applied above to Claim 13, and Levergood further discloses compressing the address portion before encryption (column 5, lines 61-65). However, Levergood does not explicitly disclose converting the address portion to lower case before compression. Official notice is taken that it is well known that addresses within URLs are case-insensitive, and that it is also well known that a hash function, by definition, will return a very different result if

even one bit of the input is changed. By extension, if an input character is changed from lowercase to uppercase, the output of a hash function will be different. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Levergood by including forcing all characters in the input to a hash function (namely the address portion) to lowercase, in order to insure that a comparison of hash function results will return the proper result.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Berman et al, US Patent 5995939, discloses a system that includes encrypting messages containing patient specific information.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2137

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZAD
zad



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER